UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese } *Associate Editors*

The Captains and the Kings Depart

By H. R. Mussey

Whither Geneva?—For What Driving?
. . . . . *Sydney Strong*

The Road Towards Disarmament
. . . . . *Brent Dow Allinson*

The Study of Man (Book Reviews)
. . . . . *Frederick Starr*

The Indian Riddle (Book Review)
. . . . . *Taraknath Das*

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 2

Chicago, March 13, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 19
The Captains and the Kings Depart—H. R. MUSSEY 21
Jottings—J. H. H 23

ARTICLES—
Karl Marx—*Friedrich Engels* 18
Whither Geneva?—For What Driving?—SYDNEY STRONG 24
The Road Towards Disarmament—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 26

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Study of Man—FREDERICK STARR 28
The Indian Riddle—TARAKNATH DAS 29

CORRESPONDENCE—
Religious Humanism—WILLIAM H. SEED 30
Unburied Dead—K. 30

THE FIELD—
Rev. Dr. Reisner Answers Questions—*Woman's Temperance Work* 18

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Rev. Dr. Reisner Answers Questions

The following questions were asked in a letter by Mrs. Sabin, head of the Organization for National Prohibition Reform to Rev. Christian F. Reisner, D. D., pastor of the Broadway Temple, New York City. We publish the questions and the answers by Dr. Reisner.

Question 1. Are you satisfied with existing conditions under national prohibition?

Answer. I am not satisfied with conditions under this law, nor am I satisfied with conditions under any other prohibitory law of which I have knowledge. The laws against theft, murder, adultery, the use of morphine and opium, the traffic laws, the laws against gambling and the social evils are all violated more than they ought to be. I think the law concerning alcohol has been as well observed as these other laws, and much better than some of them.

As a matter of fact, I am not satisfied with the way the Ten Commandments are observed, but I do not on that account favor the repeal of the Ten Commandments.

Question 2. Do you find the speakeasy an improvement over the old saloon?

Answer. I presume that this question is intended to convey the idea, industriously circulated of late, that "prohibition is responsible for the speakeasy," and that in the old days we had the saloon and did not have the speakeasy, and that now we have the choice as to which we prefer. It ought to be a sufficient answer to say that when we had the saloon we had both the saloon and the speakeasy, and we never have had any choice in the matter at all.

In some literature published in 1917, before we had national prohibition, I read the following:

" . . . The blind pig and bootlegger flourish most in the communities which license the liquor traffic. The licensed saloon inevitably breeds blind pigs.

"Licensed territory is safer territory for the illicit dealer. If drunkenness results from the sale of his goods, that drunkenness is attributed to the saloons and does not prompt investigation on the part of the police. And the blind pigger in wet territory can procure his liquor shipments without exciting suspicion, but this is not true in prohibition territory.

"As a rule, it is not hard to ascertain nearly the exact number of illicit liquor shops in any community. This is due to the fact that the blind pigger has a very wholesome fear of Uncle Sam, and while he is willing to operate without a state or local license, he is not willing to incur the danger of running without a permit from the Federal Government. So he pays his Federal tax, takes his receipt, and the transaction is recorded by the Federal Government, and then the pigger proceeds to business with no fear of the lesser authorities."

It was because of the fact that Government special stamp tax receipts were taken out that it was possible in the days

(*Continued on page* 31)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXI MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1933 Number 2

KARL MARX

(Died March 14, 1883)

"On March 14th, at a quarter of three in the afternoon, the greatest of living thinkers ceased to think. . . . The loss which his death has inflicted upon the fighting proletariat in Europe and America, and upon the science of history, is immeasurable. The gaps that will be made by the death of this Titan will soon be felt. . . .

"Before all else, Marx was a revolutionist. . . . Because he was a revolutionist, he was the best hated and most calumniated man of his time. He was shown the door by various governments, republican as well as absolutist. Bourgeois, ultra-democrats as well as conservatives, vied with one another in spreading libels about him. He brushed these aside like cobwebs, ignored them, only troubled to answer them when he had to. Yet he has gone down to his death honored, loved, and mourned by millions of workers all over the world, in Europe and Asia as far eastward as the Siberian mines, and in America as far westward as California. . . .

"His name and his works will live on through centuries."

From the Funeral Oration spoken at the grave of Karl Marx by Friedrich Engels on March 17, 1883.

We see no reason for ignoring or attempting to deny the utter seriousness of the situation in the Far East. The League of Nations has taken its stand resolutely on the side of international law and order, and in so doing in the hour of great crisis has at last established itself in the consciousness of mankind and in the councils of the world as our one most effective agency for peace. Whatever happens now, the League has done its full if somewhat belated duty, and this may be a gain to compensate for all loss. But what *is* going to happen? Already much has happened and is happening. Japan is waging a full-fledged war upon hapless China, and thereby is throwing all Asia into chaos. Propaganda on Japan's behalf, launched by influences by no means as far distant as Tokyo, is now flooding the world in the sinister form of vicious attacks upon Soviet Russia, the one power which stands immediately in the way of Nippon's triumph in China. A war between Japan and Russia lowers as the immediate storm upon the horizon, and mighty influences, outside as well as inside of Japan, propose that world opinion, if or when the storm breaks, shall *not* swing to the side of the "Reds"! But a war in Siberia is not the only menace. Another war, on the sea, is also threatening. America has taken the lead in outlawing Japan's Asian policy, and duly mobilized her fleet on the west coast. A fortnight ago Japan mobilized her fleet, and coolly announced that she well realized that the struggle in Manchuria was going to be settled *in the Pacific.* What is this but war between the United States and Nippon? Meanwhile, the disarmament cause languishes at Geneva, war commends itself to desperate minds as an easy and sure way out of the depression, a big-navy president enters the White House, and the Japanese troops go crashing into Jehol! If we have seen any situation worse than this since the assassination of the Grand Duke in 1914, we do not happen to remember what it was. Our one hope is the League, as backed by a public opinion in all nations which has not forgotten the Great War and the misery which it is visiting even at this hour upon mankind.

The European correspondent of the *Nation* lists some delightful happenings that have recently taken place in Germany. Thus, Private August Jaeger has been sentenced to ten years' penal servitude by the Supreme Court at Leipzig for conviction on a charge of desertion and disclosure of important military secrets to the French during the War. This eighteen years after the alleged offense was committed! Again, Dr. Anna Siensen, a former deputy in the Prussian Diet, has been forbidden permission to lecture in Thuringia "because she supported the views of Professor Gimbel, who lost his job at Heidelberg University for having said that a turnip was a better symbol for war than a heroic virgin." Still again, Herr Otto Rossbilt had his passport confiscated as he was about to depart on a trip to Copenhagen because he had "exposed some of the more obvious indecencies" of the armament business in his book in "The War Industry." Also, Professor Hans Cohn, of the law faculty of Breslau University, has been expelled from his position for two reasons—first, he wrote an article defending Trotsky, and secondly, he was born a Jew. One wonders, as this list of petty tyrannies is recounted, how it happens that Professor Albert Einstein remains unmolested. But one does not wonder what is coming in Germany, or has already arrived! Can any one doubt that the old regime

is coming back—or something much worse, perhaps, than the old regime? These acts of persecution were perpetrated in the brief term of Von Schleicher's rule. Now Adolf Hitler is in the saddle. Surely not much is left of Ebert's republic, and whatever may chance to remain will soon enough be cleared away. *O tempora! O mores!* And *O bellum! O pax!* If Europe passes into the doom which seems to be awaiting, it will not be difficult to trace the causes of the disaster to the Great War and to the so-called Peace which followed the War. The Versailles Treaty is now cast upon the scrap-heap, but, like so many other things, it is too late, too late!

We see nothing to shout about in the Roosevelt cabinet as unofficially announced. Hence we are not surprised that the names have been received with mild murmurs rather than loud halloos. The cabinet appears strong only in comparison with the Hoover group which it is succeeding. It looks veritably like "a thing of shreds and patches" in comparison with all the great names which were promised the nation as cabinet material during the campaign. Baker, Davis, Traylor, Ritchie, Young, Frankfurter—where are they? And echo answers, where! As we read the list of ten names, we must confess, as we would be honest with our readers, that no less than four of these names we had never even heard of before. Of at least two others we wish that we had not heard. Of the remainder, only two stir our enthusiasm. One, of course, is Frances Perkins, an ideal appointment. She is an able woman, admirably qualified and equipped to perform the duties of her office as Secretary of Labor. Also, her appointment is gratifying as breaking the tradition that this position in the cabinet is the private possession of the American Federation of Labor. The other is Senator Thomas J. Walsh, a great lawyer and a brave man, who is likely to make law respected in this country. [Senator Walsh died after the above was written.—Ed.] Of the others, Cordell Hull as Secretary of State has been widely praised, but we do not see why. He has a good mind, is a hard worker, has been long in the public service, but he is dull and stodgy, unimaginative to a high degree, and has none of that peculiar experience and knowledge which properly belong to a great foreign minister. His administration will be respectable, nothing more. The chief shame of the new cabinet is Senator Swanson—a shame either at Geneva or at Washington, perhaps at both places, for a disarmament delgate has no business in a navy office, and vice versa. William H. Woodin is the usual rich corporation magnate in charge of the nation's finances—how tired we are of the whole lot of them! James A. Farley, as usual in the case of the Post Office Department, is a politician added to the line-up for strictly political purposes. As for the rest, they amount to nothing. If Mr. Roosevelt wants them, that is his privilege. But it is tough on the country.

With all due respect to Senator Norris, whom we greatly honor for his stubborn courage and sturdy public service, we have little respect for his latest political proposal. For years, now, valiant spirits have labored to organize a party which should truly represent the progressive ideals of the nation. The old Committee of 48 was one of the best and for a time most successful movements of the kind. The great La Follette campaign, in which the old Wisconsin senator all but laid down his life for the cause, seemed to bring a progressive party right within our grasp, but in the end failed. Then came the League for Independent Political Action, which is now hard at work. And what have Senator Norris and others been doing all this time? Practicing a good deal of independence, doing many finely progressive things, but lifting not so much as a little finger in the way of giving active political support to these movements for reform! This Norris group remind us of the hero of Oliver Wendell Holmes's poem, "The Old Man Dreams," who wanted to return to his youth and yet keep his wife and family. Cried the angel:

> The man would be a boy again,
> And be a husband too!

So with these senators! They would be progressive—O, so progressive!—and yet remain safely sheltered all the while in the Republican or Democratic parties. We don't wonder that the old-line politicians, like Holmes's angel, express amazement at this insistence upon party membership and political independence at one and the same time. And we sympathize with the out-and-out progressives who express disgust at this failure of Norris and his company to come out and take their stand. Senator Norris's statement of principles was futile stuff—it is a long time since we have read so many words signifying nothing. If the Senator wants real principles of political action, let us suggest to him this—*We disavow all association with the name, organization and works of either one of the two old parties, and seek union with all men and women who would give exclusive service to the free and independent ideals of our American life.*

The "wets" are going the "whole hog," no doubt about that! "Naked repeal" is what they call it, and it is deserving of the adjective. Not a rag or a tatter of respectability or even honesty is left to hide the shame of the movement to drown the miseries of this country in "booze." For years, for example, we have been told that the "wets" were at one with the "drys" in their determination to outlaw the saloon. This one tangible and beneficent result of Prohibition, they said, should not be undone, no matter what the fate of the

Amendment. But now all pretense of keeping out the saloon is abandoned. Liquor is going to be sold without restriction, and that, of course, means the old saloon back on the old corner. Always the public has been assured that heavy drinks were as much feared and hated by the anti-Prohibitionist as by the Prohibitionist, and that nothing was desired but the recovery of light wines and beer. Now all distinction between various kinds of "drinks" is obliterated, and the way is opened not merely for wine and beer but also for whiskey, gin, rum, champagne, and every other abomination. Constantly and sanctimoniously we have been told that of course "dry" territory should be protected by all the powers of government from the incursions of the liquor traffic. Just how this "dry" territory could be protected after the 18th Amendment was destroyed, when all the powers of government had failed to protect such territory while the Amendment was in effect, was a revelation never vouchsafed from the Sinai of "booze." But now this declaration, which was always arrant hypocrisy, is now openly thrown overboard, and the "dry" states abandoned to their fate. The recent spectacle of "dry" Congressmen tumbling over themselves to vote "wet" in order to buy political support by the sale of their souls in the open market of perjury and treason was as disgusting a spectacle as even the political life of America has ever furnished, yet the "wets" openly rejoiced in it. But perhaps it is just as well. Open the sluice-gates! Let the flood come back! Release the liquor trade to do its work under the easiest conditions, and thus see again what it means to try to live under such conditions! The more complete the repeal, the quicker the return of Prohibition. It won't take many years, as things are going now, for liquor to be damned with a mightier curse than it has ever endured before.

Karl Marx is fortunate in the semi-centennial anniversary of his death, which took place on March 14, 1883. Had any occasion of the kind occurred before the War, or even during the early days of that vast conflict, there would have been little interest outside the ranks of Socialism, for Marx in those days was simply a prophet who had gone rather ridiculously astray in his reading of the future. Then in 1917 came the Russian revolution, and in "ten days that shook the world" the author of *"Das Kapital"* took on a terrible significance. But even then the momentous character of the man and his thought was not really apparent, for the revolution, as it settled down, came to be regarded as an accident rather than a logical necessity of events; and as the western nations revived, or seemed to revive, after the War, Marx was relegated to the Bolsheviki as the mad prophet of a mad cult. It was thus that Wells ridiculed and railed against him in his "Russia in the Shadows," written after his visit to Russia in 1920. But now our western nations are in chaos, capitalism is cracking up, our whole civilization is tottering to its fall—*just as Marx foresaw and foretold!* A man, in other words, whose economic philosophy was treated in our college days as a fantastic intellectual aberration completely discredited by the trends of the times, is now suddenly seen to be a scientist who read our social phenomena with amazing accuracy, and thus prophesied the truth. What seemed to refute the Marxian dogma only a few years ago is now discovered to have been a mere mirage. The great German was right! Which means at this moment certain very important facts! First, Karl Marx ranks with Darwin as one of the two greatest creative thinkers of modern times. Secondly, Karl Marx ranks all alone by himself as the greatest single influence at work during the last one hundred years in the world of practical affairs. Thirdly, that this Marxian influence, superficially the occasion of destructive revolutions, is fundamentally the material out of which is destined to be fashioned, in one shape or another, the society of the future. Where is there an irony to match the stupendous power of the lone thinker who conceived the doctrine of the materialistic interpretation of history.

The Captains and the Kings Depart

No man whose sense of humor has not been completely worn down by the depression, with its woeful flood of misery and despair, can have failed to share the hilarity of these recent weeks as one after another of our lately revered business leaders has journeyed to Washington to enlighten a waiting senatorial committee either on the question of how he would get us out of the present slough of despond or on how he helped get us into it. Fortunately we Americans are incorrigible idealists, often in the worst of causes, and no amount of evidence can shake our faith in these demi-gods of ours; so no real damage will be done by even the most naked revelation of the inner content of their mighty minds or by any showing of the code of ethics in their world. Tomorrow, thank God, with a chicken in every pot and two cars in every garage, we shall all worship at the same old shrine; but today one hears an occasional irreverent snicker from the back pew, and it may be suspected that even Adam Smith's "impartial spectator" would occasionally sympathize with the scoffer.

The chief contribution that these industrial statesmen have to offer toward the solution of the world's problem is that our government should balance its budget. When they explain how or why or with what results, the listener is mostly reminded of the adver-

tising cards that have cheered us during recent years with a beautifully colored picture of a zygodactyl scansorial bird of the order Psittaci, and the pleasing legend, "You can teach a parrot to say 'Just as good,' but he won't know what he is saying." The chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corporation, for example, believed pontifically that "if the government would put its own house in order as an example to the community, balance its budget, and live within its income, it would go a long way toward reviving public confidence." Two of the harassed politicians responsible for the "orgy of spending" inconsiderately pointed out that the budget was better than balanced when the depression began, that Congress again balanced it last spring after the Treasury had three or four times revised its estimates, and that business still plunged downward, so that taxes obstinately refused to come in. Just how would Mr. Taylor balance the budget? And the earth-shaking reply: "It seems to me that the simple rules that we apply in our lives are those to apply here . . . that we live more simply, that we curtail expenditures, that we try to bring ourselves in a state of balance." What simpler? But, the pestiferous politicians continued, what if the budget were balanced, how would that set business going again? "Well, I can only answer you as to the attitude of mind of industrialists generally. They are a confident people, hopeful people. They believe in the future, in the future of this country. And they are going to use every ounce of their energy to pull this thing out so far as it lies in their power." But, persisted the incorrigible La Follette, "they have been doing that all along, have they not?" "Now I do not believe that you should at this moment show lack of faith in the future." Peekaboo! Watch the little birdie come out. The doctrine of salvation by faith did not die with St. Paul.

But aside from their catchwords what do these "confident people, hopeful people" offer us? Let Charles M. Schwab, for forty years optimistic radiator of American prosperity by unlimited individual grabbing, answer out of the ripe wisdom of this seventy-one happy and prosperous years: "Technocracy? No, I couldn't say anything about that. Inflation? I never talk about political matters such as that. Lower interest rates? That's a little outside of my line, you know. . . . But we need most of all two things. One a better tariff that will give more protection to industry, and the other is lower taxes in every direction, especially for manufacturing." In other words, I don't know anything about it, but what *we* need most is something that will help *me* make more profits. Change one letter in the pronoun thus, and you have the fundamental philosophy of big business expressed simply and naively by one of its leading exponents and practitioners. It is an amusing philosophy.

We can touch on only a few of the quips and quirks of these weeks, but we have enjoyed seeing the former vice-president of the United States and ambassador at the Court of St. James's recalled from that exalted office to head the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and rescue the imperiled banking structure of the country by saving the little country banks, as President Hoover so emphatically assured us. Mr. Dawes cheerily testified that the Central Republic Bank and Trust Company (of which he had formerly been head and to which he returned from his arduous patriotic duties with the R. F. C.) had in his absence made strictly legal loans (which he agreed flatly violated the spirit of the law) of $12,000,000 to the late lamented Insull companies, the collateral for which loans was in turn handed over to the R. F. C. as part of the security for the $90,000,000 that the corporation in due time loaned to Mr. Dawes's bank in the process of helping the little fellows in the small towns. Naturally, Mr. Dawes thinks it should be made "more difficult for unscrupulous men to obtain proxy control of large corporations and obtain large loans from banks," but like a wise man he does "not want to go off half-baked on proposals for legislation." We found Mr. Dawes's testimony very amusing as we reflected on the history of his Chicago banks.

Then we listened to the eminent Owen D. Young, who, through his scarcely less eminent colleague, Gerard Swope, on the eve of the Insull bankruptcy (at a time, indeed, some over-nice lawyers have been trying to show, of known Insull bankruptcy) managed to loan Samuel Insull $2,000,000 of General Electric money, in the most profound ignorance, they have since assured us, of the state of the Insull companies. At about the same time, it will be remembered, a vice-president of the Guaranty Trust Company likewise loaned our distinguished exile $5,000,000 in five minutes over the telephone—in equal innocence. We have just heard from Mr. Young that Mr. Insull was "largely the victim of the complicated structure that he controlled." Mr. Young remembered "the feeling of helplessness that came over me when I began in February, 1931, to examine the structure." Notwithstanding this feeling he was quite able a year later to accommodate a good customer of the General Electric with a secured loan of two millions. It is wonderful, and amusing as well, the way our bankers and business leaders direct the stream of investment into the channels that are socially most productive, as we have for twenty-five years taught college classes.

One incident, we confess, has disturbed us, but probably we don't understand. We refer to the little pleasantry of Mr. Charles E. Mitchell, chairman of the board of the National City Bank, who, in order to stimulate him to his best endeavors, got bonuses of $3,500,000 during 1927, 1928 and 1929, in addition to his salary, but who paid no federal income tax for 1929 be-

cause he managed to sell 18,000 shares of his bank stock to a relative at a loss of $2,800,000, thus wiping out his income for the year, and then later buying the stock back from the poor relative because—bless his heart—"he simply couldn't let that purchaser take the loss." A cynical friend points out to us that it was only after the Senate committee, following a long legal fight, got access to the National City books, that it learned these facts from Mr. Mitchell, and learned, too, that the bank six years ago transferred $31,000,000 in bad sugar loans to its affiliated investment company, which paid the bank for them with the proceeds of a new sale of $25,000,000 worth of its own securities to the public. But we know, all the same, that the bankers do direct our savings into the most productive channels.

One more trifling incident, full of innocent fun! Mr. Harold L. Stuart, head of the Insull bankers, was "very proud" of the record of his company, which includes such items as arranging to "support the market" while selling securities, carrying a million shares of Insull stock owned by the company in the name of an assistant-treasurer so that the public buying Insull shares on the company's advice did not as a matter of fact know of the company's ownership. But why go on? Fussy senators wanted helpful advice for legislation, and Mr. Stuart told them that he was leaning toward advocating a plan whereby utility securities would be sold at auction by the utilities commissions, instead of being marketed as at present. Our grandfather fifty years ago, we remember, told us that in the early days in Illinois the farmers used to hang horse thieves, not because horse thieves were bad men, but because the farmers couldn't afford to have their horses stolen. In these more urbane days they would doubtless ask those gentlemen's advice as to remedial legislation, and would get suggestions on useful laws against horse stealing—or they might turn to motor traction.

These little bits of merriment, picked almost at random from dozens scarcely less amusing, have no moral. Our friend, who has no sense of humor, sourly declares that he does not believe theologically in original sin or scientifically in the natural selection of the ignorant to manage important affairs. He insists that these men are by nature just as intelligent and decent as any of the rest of us. The trouble, he asserts stoutly, is with the business system, and no more with these men than with the rest of us. He declares that despite the technocrats men by and large have got to live by work, and by cooperative work at that, but that these men have been given the job of directing things under an arrangement by which practically the test of their success is the ability to make money on a large scale for themselves and their friends, keeping out of jail at the same time. So he says they have no time to learn much about the job of directing things intelligently, even if it made any great difference in their practical job of making money, and that they have to look at things from a practical standpoint, even if their acts sometimes shock senators, who are in the happy position of making a living by talking. We tell him that he is too bolshevistic, and that like all radicals he lacks humor; and we invite him to look at the morning paper, with its news of the National City Bank loaning its officers $2,400,000 without interest in November, 1929, to cover their speculations in National City stock, so as to "sustain the morale of the organization and to protect the officers in the existing emergency," at the same time that it was making no such loans to employees and was selling out customers who had got caught just like the officers. But the man refuses to smile; he has absolutely no sense of humor.

H. R. Mussey.

Jottings

President Franklin D. Roosevelt is the third president to duplicate the name of a predecessor—John Quincy Adams followed his father, Benjamin Harrison his grandfather, and now Roosevelt his distant cousin. And in all these years we have never had in the White House a Smith, a Jones, or a Brown.

All kings are divided into three parts: (1) ruling kings, like George V; (2) exiled kings, like Wilhelm II; and (3)—the King of Italy!

A report of freight traffic handled in 1932 by the nation's railroads (New York *World-Telegram*):

> This was a reduction of 81,144,250,000 net ton miles, or 23.9 per cent under that for 1931, and a reduction of 163,128,-319,000 net miles, or 38.6 per cent under that for 1930. This reduction in the amount of freight traffic handled during the last year resulted in large part from business conditions that existed in 1932.

Here is reasoning power of the very first order. Think of the capacity of this journalistic brain which makes the epoch-making discovery that the "reduction" of freight traffic in 1932 "resulted in large part from business conditions that existed in 1932"! Such original thought is astounding.

Albert Schweitzer, in his new autobiography, declares that Rousseau's *"Contrat Social"* is "the greatest linguistic creation in French"; and Luther's translation of the Bible and Nietzsche's *"Jeuseits von Gut und Böse"* the "nearest perfection in German." What work holds a similarly top rank in English?

A correspondent asks us to write in 500 words, "even 100," an answer to the question:

> What do you think should be done in government, business,

education, and religion, in order to stabilize the social situation? A ten-word telegram should easily suffice to handle this problem. Why waste words?

Bernard Shaw thinks the time has come for him to "shut up." We agree, if his recent utterances and his latest book are any sign of the real condition of his mind.

J. H. H.

Whither Geneva?—For What Driving?

[From our Special Correspondent]

Every person should endeavor to tell the truth about Geneva, for the issues are life or death. Truth is ordinarily told too late. May I be saved from being an obituary writer! In Geneva during the past year I have observed certain things of which, if I did not speak the very Mountain would shout out!

1. *Britain Dominates at Geneva.*

When I came to Geneva over a year ago I brought no such idea with me. I have known Britain now for over forty years, having bicycled a half-dozen times up and down the Isles, having been in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Egypt, Palestine, Canada, and while my attitude has not been uncritical it has always been friendly, and my ancestry is English for centuries back. What I have found at Geneva has been largely discovery. I am in Geneva at my own charges, as a free lance observer. I have been almost a constant attendant on the Peace Conference (as expressing itself in Committees, Bureau, General Commission).

I have attended scores of meetings of the Council —the Executive Committee of the League of Nations— with 14 members, five being "Big Powers" (guns do really count in making up a "Power")—I have seen money voted to some impecunious nation (a debt expected to be paid), I saw Irak voted into Independence (Britain retaining some safeguard power and a few concessions), I saw the Persian-Oil controversy "settled" and most of all I have followed the Japan-China embroglio from beginning to end (?), and in all the proceeding I was compelled to see that Britain was the dominant power. I hazard the guess that the attitude of the British delegate on the Council (at one time Thomas, then Cecil, but mostly Simon) accounts for much of the delay and evasion on the part of Japan. What understanding, if any, there was between England and Japan, everyone is at liberty to guess. Certainly, several leading London papers did not hesitate to refer not infrequently to their "old ally, Japan."

Britain dominates at the Peace Conference, partly by dominating Geneva and the League. I mention only a few facts. In the first place, Henderson, President; Drummond, Secretary-General; Simon, First Orator (by right, I figure it out, by political primogeniture) are all of Britain. It is worth noting that the new head of the Labor wing of the League is British. Here is a single instance of recent date which shows how things are done. The Council decided that it would be a good thing for the world if an economic conference were to be held. Then it was decided that Simon should be chairman of the Agenda Committee, that the conference should be held in London, that Macdonald should be President of the conference. This is as close to being all-British as one could modestly require. London is the last place to hold a conference unless a high-charged British atmosphere is required! The Peace education carried on in Geneva, last year, was dominated by Britain. Ditto, the religious campaign for influencing the Conference. The propaganda—news sent out to English-speaking nations (America included) was and is largely from English sources. I could name individuals and organizations. Little is done by way of peace propaganda in reaching the English-speaking peoples without the approval of the League of Nations Union, of which Cecil is head.

2. *Britain Is Responsible.*

A whole year has passed. The Conference has been under the command of General Delay. As we look back to the first days—days of bright promise, and glowing words, when the peoples of earth voiced unanimously their heart's desire for a warless world—then come to the anniversary after a year, see the nets let down for results, alas, they come up empty. Not one inch of progress in disarming! Programs, methods of procedure—yes, but not one inch of progress to disarm— not one less gun in the world, but more and more—and, horrid war in the East, West, both far and near. With the world in a worse condition in February, 1933, than in February, 1932.

Why do I attach blame to Britain? First, because the power of control is in her hands. Second, the chief leader in delay was the British delegate. It often seemed to me also that the Secretariat was not in a rush for disarmament. There were two or three distinct times when Britain plainly threw a switch or blocked the wheels that defeated progress toward real disarmament. The first time was when the Soviet plan for drastic disarmament came up. No one who was there those early days can doubt that Simon was chief antagonist to what would have been real disarmament. Then the days went by. Summer was coming on, with no sign of harvest. Suddenly the American (Hoover's) Proposals—real proposals not a mere method (such as the British Program is)—came to the Conference. I favor total disarmament, but here was really a chance for the Conference to start in and secure disarmament. It called for about one-third cut all 'round. What was done? After a short perfunctory discussion, they were turned over to a drafting committee which is well supplied with surgical instruments and chloroform, then, a day was set to prepare in two weeks a "First Phase" statement as to where the Conference had come. The day arrived. The American proposals were stowed away in an innocuous paragraph of a resolution, which contained no *results*, but provision for a Permanent Disarmament Commission (note this, for here began the building a "cart before the horse") a matter that every lover of Peace ought to observe with critical eyes.

I call attention to a matter—generally overlooked, and which I consider most important. On the very day that the American proposals were practically rejected *Germany withdrew from the Conference.* The reason is plain. The treatment accorded such proposals as the

American naturally led her to believe that there would be no serious attempt to disarm down to her level. She argued logically and naturally that the "first phase" resolution was the child of Simon. He is responsible for the switch thrown that sidetracked the Hoover proposals, and led to the retirement of Germany. That nearly killed the *Conference.* Norman Davis did come from America and walk round Europe and Macdonald did turn in and work under the "Five Big Powers" caption (a blunder so far as the Conference was considered and its integrity) and Germany did return, after six months, after she had gone through bad times, due in part to the treatment at Geneva. Then came the Christmas holidays. What would diplomats do for an alibi if it were not for "holidays"? Then, January 23rd the Disarmament Commission met to begin!

I cannot avoid the belief that during this year Britain has been the leader in delay, both general and specific. In her hands has been the power of control.

3. *What Does the Future Hold?*

Geneva has now come to the middle of February. What next?

There are *two things* that have been already voted for the Peace Convention. These two things, if obtained, Britain and perhaps another Power or two would consider the Conference as having rewarded them entirely for all the outlay, no matter if there be little disarmament. These two things have not been much in evidence, but brought in, in a kind "of course" manner, i. e., as if taken for granted. These two important items have been adopted by the Conference, without much discussion and observation. I am not naive enough to think that the Secretariat has not observed them with some satisfaction. These two things are:

(1) *A Permanent Disarmament Commission* (voted in July), and to

(2) *Function through the Council of the League of Nations* (voted in December).

Now let me say frankly: Two main objectives have been gained.

With the power of control that Britain has over the Council, that is all she would want from the Conference. The amount of disarmament would be of little concern. The nation or nations that could control that Commission working through the Council would nearly control the world. To me it has extremely sinister bearings. In the first place, no nation should ever sign any Peace Convention unless drastic reduction of arms has been clearly provided for, not *promised.* In the second place, the Council of the League can not be trusted to function in disarmament. It is too much *involved in politics*—it would be eternally weighing every problem as to how *it would affect the League.* One cannot tell whether the Council, for example the past year, has been more anxious to "save the League" or "save the peace of the Far East." Disarmament of the nations should be carried through by a body quite separate from the League. To bring them together, in functioning, will be very hard for the League, and for Disarmament.

A Permanent Disarmament Commission functioning through the Council of the League would not bring peace to the peoples of earth. During the past year a few of the Big Powers have been solicitous about these two things, to be worked thus in combination. This would mean investing these few Powers with control over the world, and the Conference would result not in disarmament but in concentration of power-control. The conference in adopting the provision to create a Permanent Disarmament Commission to function through the Council (remember the experience in the case of the Far East trouble) is building a "cart" and putting it before the "horse" (of disarmament) when the "horse" is not even in sight!

And now a year has gone past. No disarmament yet. Even the doves of the postage stamps of Geneva have given place to William Tell bows and arrows! The Bureau and the General Commission are to meet and face the problems of Effectives, Land War Material, Air, Naval Forces. The delegates will start in this week for "action," as has been often remarked, not talking. Eden, of England, by the aid of his chart will seek to steer the boat through the rapids, with Scylla of Disarmament on one side and Charybdis of Security on the other.

Eden! That's a suggestive name. It reminds me of that period of innocence when God walked and talked with man; also alas! of "man's first disobedience which brought death and woe into the world." If Eden, of England, can only help the race to "regain that blissful seat," immortal glory will be his! Here is hoping! The nation that has just made the record for long distance flying through the heavens may produce a man who will eclipse all others—in securing disarmament. Suppose, some afternoon, *soon,* in Room G, he would put on his engaging look (supported by Mrs. Ashby's conquering smile) and look down the table, and say:

"Litvinoff! I have been meditating over your program, with the big cut and the non-aggressive pacts. England is willing to meet you half way. Russia and England have been rivals for centuries. Let's cut it out. Neither is getting anywhere, by it. I'm for your non-aggressive pact. Let it be between your empire and mine! The "Lion" and the "Bear" were pretty cheap stuff—that would do for the Victorians!" And, Litvinoff with his beatific smile would meet half way and clasp hands.

"And, Nadolny," says Eden, turning to the stalwart German on his left, "give me your hand! What fools we are not to see clearly that the one thing to do is to disarm down at least to Germany's level. Hoch! And that took only ninety days! No permanent commission for that job. I hope that the president, Henderson, will soon take a vote on our going down to Germany's level! And—smiling at Boncour—I know you will be for it."

"And, Gibson," continues Eden, looking at the handsome, modest American, "that one-third cut proposition of your President did hit us all in a heap, but we've thought it over and are willing to go you one better. I take the liberty—in absence of my distinguished colleague Sir John—to add another one-third which will make two-thirds. After all that will leave enough for any decent nation to lug around. I know that some of our "die-hards" like Churchill will die early over such reduction, but we are willing to risk the big cut. (As we say about debts, it is better to give than to receive!) As long as we hold the record in fast flying, long-distance flying, highest altitude, why worry, since we can get away easily!"

"And, by the way, Gibson, let me introduce you to Litvinoff. He's worth knowing. Wide traveler. Executive for big property. If you are going to Siberia, ought to know him for valuable letters of introduction. Good company. We're all in the same boat. Can't get

out of it. Don't be uppish. Remember, America was once like Siberia—a great unworked continent."

And Gibson waved his hand. The trouble had been only modesty, for which Americans are noted. All cheered.

"And, Mr. Henderson," continued Eden, "I ask the privilege of reading a short letter from one of our fellow-citizens, the famous Gandhi of India (who really ought to be a member of our Conference, but is detained)—he is writing to an American and he says, "Permanent disarmament will be initiated by a strong nation irrespective of the consent and cooperation of other nations." He was writing of America. I wonder who'll win this record? England may do it! What a world it would be!

If England would only lead in such noble enterprise! This is her day! In her hands today is the power of control! Will she do it? We watch. And, God also in the shadow watches—the Power that respects not men or nations!

Or will General Delay command in 1933, as he did in 1932?

SYDNEY STRONG.

Care American Express
Geneva, Switzerland

The Road Towards Disarmament

The true road towards disarmament lies, not through the swamp of international naval and military conferences, but only over the highlands of the political organization of the civilized, stable states of the world. In reality, this crowning achievement of human intelligence—if and when it is realized—requires only the extension into the savage arena of the international anarchy of certain fertile ideas and long-tested practices, the building up of certain habits of thought and action, or attitudes, which are now entirely natural within all the more advanced states of the world, but which once seemed utopian to them. It requires the sustained, effective collaboration, and mutual confidence, of only five governments—Great Britain, United States, Russia, Germany, France. These five states are the real arbiters of war and peace, barbarism or civilization.

So conceived, the problem clarifies, and becomes much less complex than it appears in the midst of the bewildering diplomatic duplicities of Geneva. If the trusted representatives of these five organized nations could meet in continuous conference and co-operative candor, there would be no possibility of war, and no need of belligerent armament, in the world. Even the Japanese would bow, and bow quickly, to such preponderance of economic and moral authority. Why not create such a continuous conference, at Washington, as the necessary implementation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, for the defense of civilization? . . .

The American nation, by reason of its long experience in the successful operation of a democratic federal structure embracing a vast area, and because of its economic power and geographic security, is in a unique position to lead the way of human progress. It has, above all, the duty of remaining true to itself and its own vision of political organization. It is not confused and misled, as are some other states and peoples, by foggy and romantic conceptions of grandiose State-absolutism and worship. It knows that the State exists for man, not man for the State; that it has no divine origin or life of its own independent of the erring mortals who compose it; that it is, in effect, but one of the ways in which they have learned to cooperate for their own better existence and protection, or for the protection of certain privileged classes.

It is necessary for the American people to realize, however, that self-isolation is not security; and that only through a larger co-operation and confidence is prosperity or peace to be assured. To this end tariffs must be simultaneously lowered, a stable international medium of exchange created and maintained, independent of the influence of any single national government and of the colossal political debts of the recent past. The Bank for International Settlements, already set up in skeleton at Basle, needs but strengthening and development, with courage and imagination; the Hague Courts need but to be reduced in size, enhanced in authority and disentangled from political interference by the body that now designates, and pays, and delimits the function of the Permanent Court of International Justice—the League of Nations; and international society to be de-militarized by the simultaneous suppression of the military conscription system, wherever it exists, and by the consolidation of the Anglo-American and French navies into a single police-force for the maintenance of the safety and the freedom of international commerce on the high seas, and through the world's essential straits and canals. Thus would the requisite political organs of a functioning world commonwealth rapidly be brought into being, by use and unobstructed intercommunication, swift as electricity.

Before any of these simple, sensible measures may be realized, however, something like a re-education of the American people in the realities of contemporary technological civilzation, and in the technique of money, credit and exchange, needs to take place. As the requisite proof of our capacity for international citizenship, and of our emergence as a nation from the ostrich-sands of an impossible and non-existent isolation, we shall be required to abandon, by proclamation, our untenable, traditional doctrine of irresponsible commercial neutrality. Certain steps are, at long last, now being taken in this direction, thanks to the depression and to dire events in the Far East. Certain bills and resolutions are pending in Congress, introduced originally by Representatives Burton and Hull, of Ohio and Illinois, and by Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, looking to the prohibition of the export of arms and munitions, and the making of loans, from American territory, to states or governments engaged in armed operations in violation of the solemn pledges of the Pact of Paris. President Hoover has recently asked Congress for authority to lay down such embargoes against illicit

activities directed in aid of, or profit from, the conduct of belligerent and criminal operations. These measures deserve the active support of every civilized citizen of the Republic and the world.

The general purport of these measures, and the reform of American policy, intended to be accomplished by them, may be summarized, as follows:

For the Repeal of Indiscriminate Commercial Traffic, traditionally called Neutrality, for the Better Promotion of International Security and Disarmament:

Whereas, it appears from recent international history that disarmament and security of the civilized states of the world must advance simultaneously, by equal measures, or not at all;

And whereas, it is now evident that the traditional American doctrine and policy of Neutrality—meaning thereby the assertion and defense of the so-called right of American citizens, merchants and manufacturers, to sell munitions and supplies of warfare indiscriminately to belligerent governments and to be protected by the American Government in so doing—is incompatible with the full moral obligation assumed by our Government in adopting the Pact of Paris for the Renunciation of War, by reason of the fact that any public armed conflict anywhere is a dangerous menace to the security and peace of peoples everywhere;

And whereas, the organization of permanent peace among the nations is seriously retarded by the uncertainty attending the course of national policy under the traditional doctrine and rights of Neutrality; and the long-sought reconciliation of the principles of the Pact of Paris and of the Covenant of the League of Nations will be advanced by a revival of the second of the Fourteen Points proclaimed by President Wilson, and accepted by the then Allied and Central Powers as basic to the organization of peace, reading: . . . "Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters . . . except as the seas may be closed, in whole or in part, by international action for the enforcement of international covenants";

Be it, therefore, resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States that it shall be illegal, from a date to be fixed in each case by the President, for American citizens directly or indirectly to sell, exchange, export or transport military arms or munitions of any kind to any representative of any state or government engaged in armed international conflict in violation of its obligations under the Pact of Paris, such violation to be evidence by its refusal to accept arbitration or other peaceable and judicial means of investigation and settlement of any controversy in which it may be engaged;

And be it further resolved, that it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to take such measures, and recommend to the Congress such legislation, as shall in his judgment be useful in effecting collaboration with the governments of other states in bringing the conflict to a speedy termination consistent with justice, by the exercise of diplomatic, economic and financial pressure upon the belligerents, excluding from consideration all threat or exercise of armed violence. . . .

II.

Peace is not to be won nor kept, in this kind of a world, merely by good resolutions, nor yet by selfish indifference. Good deeds in time, and some sacrifice for the larger commonweal are requisite. The United States, always playing a lone hand, has until now been unwilling to assure the world of its readiness to assume and to exercise the measure of responsibility and of collaboration in the maintenance of peace which its power and position require. Peace, verily, is a pearl of great price. The United States has been unwilling to pay that price—the price of disarmament—in any curtailment of its commercial operations. Some words spoken by M. Loucheur, the French industrialist and statesman, are pertinent today. He was recently quoted by Paul Scott Mowrer, the veteran American journalist, as saying, in 1923:

France is accused of militarism at the very moment when in the hearts of an immense majority of its children there is written only the word "Peace." . . . As for me, I accuse of militarism those who do not want to do what is necessary in order that peace should be finally assured. I accuse of militarism those who would be satisfied with mere peaceful appearances and who do not want to do what is necessary to establish invincibly a true reign of peace.

The struggle to end war has not yet won a major victory. It remains for the present generation to achieve, by fulfilling the prescient pledge of Woodrow Wilson, speaking of the Five Needs of Permanent Peace, in September, 1918, as follows:

In the same sentence in which I say that the United States will enter into no special arrangements or understandings with particular nations, let me say also that the United States is prepared to assume its full share of responsibility for the maintenance of the common covenants and understandings upon which peace must henceforth rest. We still read Washington's immortal warning against "entangling alliances" with full comprehension and an answering purpose. But only special and limited alliances entangle; and we recognize and accept the duty of a new day in which we are permitted to hope for a general alliance which will avoid entanglements and clear the air of the world for common understandings and the maintenance of common rights.

The United States government, by refusing to accept any restriction upon the eight-inch gun cruiser at Geneva, in 1927, by rejecting flatly the British suggestions at London, in 1930, for the abolition of the dreadnaught, by declining to consider the French demands for an agreement to consult and to co-operate in the event of any sudden armed aggression and violation of the Pact of Paris and the League Covenant (like that of the Japanese government, in recent months)—the United States, by fatuously separating the intergovernmental debts from the solution of the devastating problem of German political debts, called "reparations," by its mischief-making demands for "parity" with the greatest naval power; by rigid adherence to extremely high-tariff policy, despite grievous injuries inflicted on its own people and others; by unfortunate delay in making plain its fullest moral and diplomatic collaboration with the League of Nations in the latter's fatally procrastinating and ineffective endeavors to preserve China from mutilation and outrage,—and, most particularly, by failure to revise its own traditional commercial "neutrality" policy to conform with the newer obligations of international partnership, in fulfilment of the law of peace, and the requirements of non-violence and security; by refusing to negotiate equitably with the government at Moscow; by these several serious sins of omission and commission the United States has, unwittingly blocked the road of the bewildered peoples toward their salvation in international confidence and disarmament. And despite the great potential importance of the "Stimson Doctrine," refusing recognition of the legal validity of any situation, treaty or advantage obtained in violation of existing agreements by the use, or threat, of armed force,—a doctrine not yet fully accepted even by the League, to say nothing of the British—the American Government and its delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference still refuses, so far as this observer can see, to meet the remorseless logic of the French mind even half way. . . Do the American people really understand the price of peace and of disarmament? . . . We doubt it.

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

The Study Table

The Study of Man

After a brief introductory chapter on the history of ethnological theories, which is the least satisfactory part of his book and might with no serious loss be omitted, Dr. Radin takes up his theme, "Social Anthropology,"[1] and develops it under five headings: the organization of the state, the organization of law and custom, the organization of economic and industrial life, religion and ritualism, literature and mythology. The book is a vigorous revolt against that school of anthropological thought which considered human culture a single, continuous, evolution. Its aim is to show that there have been many evolutions and that the culture of any given people is a thing of itself, different from that of any other. There has been, and is, evolution. The conditions of today have grown out of the past. Every culture is now changing. The evolution and growth are the result of influences which at a given time, at a given place, act upon a culture inherited from the past. Our author's treatment is a new one for such a textbook. Under each division he presents a brief sketch of the life and culture of several peoples, carefully selected to show the diversity of development in the feature studied. Thus, in considering the organization of economic and industrial life he presents—introduction, division of labor, hunting people: the Bushmen, food gatherers: the Pomo, fishing-hunting people: Central Eskimo, herding people: the reindeer Chuckchee, fishing food gatherers: the Kwakiutl, hunting-agriculture: the Hidatsa, terraced-agriculture: the Bontoc Igorot, industrial community: the Akikuyu. These cultures do not represent stages in a single uniform culture evolution; they represent independent local developments. Our author does not discuss the much mooted question of transmission versus independent origin. Both occur and have occurred throughout human history. He lays no stress upon race and race differences. One might easily read the entire book and not know to what races the different peoples considered belong. A highly commendable feature of the book is that non-American peoples are given as much consideration as American tribes. This is a distinct gain. In American textbooks the American Indians have been so exclusively studied that we have come to think of their cultures as being norms and many of our writers have been densely ignorant of all the world outside. Those who know Paul Radin's earlier books will expect to find much emphasis laid upon the exceptional individual and his influence upon his culture—an important point. This emphasis and the influence of his former studies have led to quite a different treatment in Part Five to what is found in the other parts. It is rather a pity for the rigid application of his method here is quite possible and would have been more useful than the restatement of previously presented material. The book is fresh, original and stimulating.

In "Man as Psychology Sees Him,"[2] we are told by the publishers that Professor Robinson answers the questions—*Why do we act as we do? Why do we think and feel as we do? Why do we talk as we do?* One is naturally reminded of Doctor Dorsey's "Why We Behave Like Human Beings," which caused a considerable stir a few years ago. But Robinson's book is a much more reasonable book than Dorsey's. It is not a continuous string of labored epigrams, but is written in a lively, familiar style. Dorsey was behaviorist to the extreme: Robinson is behaviorist, of course, but confines behaviorism to legitimate limits and leaving open the possibility of its being even further circumscribed in the future. If one wished to criticize our author in general terms it might be said that he is indeed timid of committing himself to any dogma. He clearly feels that he is shattering idols, but, while he continues to shatter, it is with a kindly spirit and with recognition that what he comes nearest to asserting may, after all, call for modification. His chapters are: motives to action, heredity or environment, living and learning, what is thought? the rational man, the whole man, mind and body. His attitude is well exemplified in his discussion of heredity and environment. Of course, notwithstanding the present attitude of the sociologist, he holds heredity as fundamental and supplying the material with which environment, must do what it can. Still he grants environment much power. He is here as nearly dogmatic as anywhere, but takes pains to maintain balance. His discussion of maturation is one of the best in the book. One of his major quests is the definition of personality and a brief quotation concerning it may fairly show his quality and attitude:

> In modern, scientific psychology, the personality has replaced the soul. The soul was immaterial, unobservable and indivisible. The personality is material, in that it is thought of as being inseparable from the body, it is definitely observable, and it is susceptible to analysis. The soul was unchanging, even immortal. The personality is subject to changes. The infant has it only vaguely and potentially; the dead man has no personality at all.

We have referred only to Part One of the book; it is all that is truly included in the title. There is, however, a second part—*Psychology: its aims, its deeds, its follies.* It is good stuff, but beside the subject. The book is interesting, comprehensible and thought provoking.

The appearance of an English translation of Fray Bernardino de Sahagun's *"Historia general de las Cosas de Nueva España"*[3] is a noteworthy event. All students of Aztec Mexico have had to go to that work for infortion frequently not to be found elsewhere. Sahagun came to Mexico less than thirty years after the Conquest. The christianization had been vigorously pushed, the older Indians still remembered the ideas, the beliefs and the customs of the past. Sahagun soon mastered the Aztec language, which he spoke and wrote with facility. Through thirty years he was active in his religious duties and he knew and loved his Indians as a father might know and love his children. He wrote sixteen works, mostly in Aztec, dealing with the people or intended for their instruction or for aiding the clergy in their work of conversion. Only one of these was printed during his lifetime—a *psalmodia* in Aztec. Most of the others have never been printed. The *Historia general* waited almost three centuries before it was put into type—being printed in 1829 (and 1840) from the Spanish manuscript under the editorship of Carlos Maria de Bustamante. Sahagun worked over his material through many years. At least ten different manuscripts were prepared by him of part or all of it. Some

1. "Social Anthropology." Paul Radin. New York: 1932. McGraw-Hill Book Co. 8vo. pp. xii. 432. Price $6.50.

2. "Man as Psychology Sees Him." Edward D. Robinson. New York: 1932. The Macmillan Co. 16mo. pp. vii. 376. Price $2.50.

3. "1547-1577. A History of Ancient Mexico." Bernardino de Sahagun. Translated by Fanny R. Bandelier. Nashville: 1932. Fisk University Press. Vol. i. 8vo. pp. ix. 315. Price

of these were in Aztec only; others were in Aztec with Spanish translation. None of these remain entire at present. Fragments exist in libraries in Spain and Mexico. Copies were made at various times, one of which is in Florence, Italy. Fray Bernardino's manuscript, as he finished it, consisted of twelve books, each divided into chapters and paragraphs. The material was gathered from the Indians themselves and taken down in Aztec. The work began in 1547 and was completed and turned over to the (Franciscan) Order in 1569. Bustamante's edition of the work is in four volumes. In 1829 he edited book twelve of Sahagun's arrangement which was definitely historical. In 1840, he published the remaining eleven books, dealing with Aztec life and culture, in three volumes. Mrs. Bandelier has worked from this edition. Of it she says:

> The language (Spanish) being a literal translation from the Mexican idiom, is forcibly often crude and heavy and tiresome to read, and few may be the students who will read even the Spanish version from cover to cover.

(Your reviewer is one of these few.) But, it is still the most precious original source of information in its field. In the volume at hand we have, first a biography of Sahagun, then the translation of books one to four, lastly a bibliography of Sahagun's works, which Mrs. Bandelier attributes to Garcia Icazbalceta, but which she has interpolated to the degree that it is sometimes difficult to decide what is his, what her's. The four books here translated deal with the gods which the Ancient Mexicans adored, the calendar (feasts and sacrifices with which the natives honored their gods in the times of their paganism), on the beginnings of the gods, about judicial astrology or art of divining, which these Mexicans used. Mrs. Bandelier is the widow of Adolf F. Bandelier, whose important studies of the Aztecs constituted a landmark in Americanist investigation. She is herself a Spanish-American, who knows English as well as her mother tongue and is especially qualified for her work. High praise should be given to Fisk University for undertaking the publication, which forms a number in their *Social Science Series*. It is to be hoped that a generous support will be given to their enterprise. No more deserving source material could be found for patronage and it is to be hoped that the publication of the entire work may be carried through to conclusion.

FREDERICK STARR.

The Indian Riddle

This book* has special value because Mr. Coatman, Professor of Imperial Economic Relations at the University of London, and recently attached to the First and Second Round Table Conferences, must have formed his ideas of the solution of Indian unrest not only through his own personal study and observations, but through the influence of the far-sighted British officials in India and England who recognize the necessity of making some concession to the Indian people, while keeping the actual control of Indian administration on all vital matters in the hands of the British. Mr. Coatman is far-sighted enough to recognize certain obvious mistakes of a certain type of British official and politician who are not willing to grant any form of concession towards the fulfilment of India's right to freedom.

Mr. Coatman is not a pro-Indian; and his foremost desire is to preserve British supremacy in India, and thus to check the Indian nationalist movement from assuming a serious international character. Indian political leaders are not conscious of this aspect of the significance of the nationalist movement; they are not working for establishing international relations of a nationalist India. Therefore it is doubly interesting to note Professor Coatman's views, which may become an eye-opener to Indian politicians lacking world vision. He writes:

> Almost without exception the British press ignores India, except when an inter-communal riot, or terrorist outrage or other such uncommon event is noticed. . . . But it cannot be doubted that foreigners have on the whole, been quicker than the British people *to perceive the world importance of the Indian problem.* (pp. 5-7).

He further adds:

> *The importance of world opinion in relation to India should not be overlooked, because nowadays this is one of the factors at work moulding our policy towards our great dependency.* Obviously we cannot allow ourselves to be guided entirely by the opinion of the outside world. . . . *But equally obviously, we cannot ignore it, because if we try to do so we shall quickly find it reacting on us in matters which have no connection with India. And after all, this foreign view of India as a nation in all respects except her possession of autonomy in her government has a certain correspondence with the truth of the situation. . . . The ideas* and aspirations of large numbers of her (India's) leading citizens *and finally a growing consciousness of opinion in the world outside the British Empire have all combined to give India many of both formal and spiritual attributes of nationality.* (pp. 16-17.)

Professor Coatman tries to impress upon his countrymen that the strength, vitality and depth of the Indian Nationalist movement must not be minimized. This movement today is very different from what it was twenty years ago, because it has penetrated into villages and has secured the support of the masses. To quote:

> The Indian villager knows no more about the full meaning and implication of Dominion Status than does the English villager, or for that matter, the average man in the street of London. But, although he is unversed in the political and metaphysical subtleties connected with the conception of Dominion Status for India, the Indian villager is becoming interested in the agitation which is carried on for the government of India by Indians. The agitators have seen to that. Year by year, for the past decade, the organization of Indian Home Rulers, as we may conveniently call the leaders of the Indian Nationalist Movement, has grown in size and in effectiveness, and the arousing of peasantry from their condition of submissive acceptance of the state of life which it has pleased God and their rulers to call them is now well in the forefront of their program. . . . The traditional acquiescence of the Indian villager in his lot will before long be a thing of the past. . . . *We can take it that politics, and in particular, the vast section of Indian politics summed up in the term the "Nationalist Movement" does mean something to the masses.* (pp. 10-12.)

Prof. Coatman further writes:

> *A study of the history of India will leave no doubt in the mind of any competent observer that the foundations of the Indian nationalist movement are deep and genuine, that the Movement itself is one of the type which we have encountered before in our Imperial history, and that it will ultimately achieve its aims, which is the establishment of an autonomous government in India.* (p. 14.)

The granting of the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms began a new era in Indian politics. Furthermore, the announcement of Lord Irwin in October, 1929, that the ultimate goal of India's political progress is Dominion Status, which declaration has been confirmed by the proceedings of the Round Table Conferences, makes it clear *that the essence of the problem of India, from now on "is how to transfer the Government of India from the hands of foreigners to those of their own people"* (p. 9 and p. 19). Prof. Coatman

---

*"The Indian Riddle," by John Coatman. Published by Humphrey Toulmin & Co., London.

thinks that although the Government of India Act of 1919 gives the Governor-General the right to issue ordinances as acts of extraordinary legislation, it is certain that "rule by ordinances" will never be able to suppress the Nationalist movement.

According to Professor Coatman, the greatest obstacle in the way of further advance in transferring the political control of the country into Indian hands lies in Hindu-Moslem rivalry, because the political leaders of these communities are interested in gaining supremacy one over the other. For instance, the Moslem program is to gain supremacy over the Provinces of Bengal, the Punjab, the Northwestern Frontiers, and Sind through perpetuation of communal electorates, whereas the Hindus demand the abolition of communal electorates so that they may hold control of the country through their numerical superiority, greater intellectual progress, and financial strength. Mr. Coatman thinks that the British Government is not responsible for the situation, although no Indian Nationalist will agree with him on this point. It is sincerely believed by Indians of all shades of political opinion that one of the reasons for the introduction of "communal electorates" into the Indian Constitution is to "divide and rule" the people by augmenting communal rivalry.

Prof. Coatman's suggested solution of the present situation in India is that the Indian provinces should be immediately granted provincial autonomy with the minimum reservation of power in the hands of the Governor for emergency purposes. He is convinced that there is no prospect for a federated India in the near future, although there must be a federated India in course of time. He does not think that there can be any full responsibility in the central Government. It would not be wise to have divided responsibility between the Legislature and Executive, although the Governor-General should be endowed with full power over defense, foreign affairs and finance. Therefore he suggests that "the Government of India be turned into a Council composed of the best men who can be found. The British Indian representatives and the representatives of the States must be men of influence with their communities and their peers respectively, whilst the British members of the Government must be men of ability, and above all, men who believe in what they are doing.

Now one may ask the question: will Professor Coatman's proposed program for the Government of India solve the Indian problem? Will the introduction of provincial autonomy and a Government of India by a Council, not responsible to the central legislature satisfy the Indian Nationalists? Prof. Coatman is right in suggesting that there must be responsible government in India; but his solution will not give the people of India that "substance of independence" which they are demanding. British statesmen are beginning to recognize that repressive measures are no solution of the Indian riddle. It is to be hoped that they will recognize that granting meager concessions will not satisfy even the moderate Nationalists of India; and any measure that will not satisfy the Indian Nationalists will ultimately be rejected by the Indian people. The only solution of Indian riddle lies in conferring that freedom which the people of India are demanding as their birthright.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Correspondence

Religious Humanism

Editor of UNITY:

This letter is addressed to the Religious Humanists particularly, and liberals, socialists and humanitarians generally.

Religious Humanism promises to be the starting point of a new religion, but it has been preceded by several other somewhat similar attempts, as for instance Positivism and Ethicism. These movements, and the liberal churches also, have a strong tendency to develop into little groups, whose real religion is middle class respectability, and who find literary, philosophical and mildly Socialistic addresses a welcome substitute for Christian or Jewish sermons. How can Humanism escape this fate?

Success in the task all these movements have essayed depends upon the solution of several difficult problems. We have to have a scientific, non-supernatural and Socialist philosophy by which we ourselves may lead harmonious lives. It must be a philosophy which will comfort us in face of the heart-rending contrast between life as it is and as it ought to be. It must emphasize this contrast, steel us to cure it, yet reconcile us to it. It must give us courage and enthusiasm to sacrifice ourselves for the cause yet it has no supernatural God and can promise us no reward after death and no punishment for those who make hell on earth.

Having developed such a philosophy we must preach it in language which will be understood by the masses.

We must have an organization, guided by scientifically trained religious leaders who, in accordance with the best psychological principles, must keep our weaker brothers and sisters in the right path. We must have definite ideas as to just what is the right path, and exactly what each individual must do to make the best of himself and to save the world. The religions which are permanent always find institutional expression. Mere preaching, even if it inspires at the moment, is soon forgotten. We have somehow to develop a well drilled membership with the greatest possible development of each person's individuality.

And we must solve the financial problem, notwithstanding the permanence of the depression, without making concessions to the prejudices of the monied classes. We cannot afford to compromise with even the most cherished of generally accepted superstitions in regard to private property, theology, sex, race, nationality, patriotism or anything else.

We have to combine the utmost courage with the greatest tact. In our antagonism to those who feel that whatever is is right, we must not fall for those reactionists who feel that whatever is is wrong. True liberalism must combine intelligent conservatism with revolutionary radicalism. We must have implicit faith that we shall triumph because we are right, and we must never hesitate to sacrifice immediate advantage for the sake of principle.

In short, to be saved we must do a great deal more than write philosophical essays and deliver literary, philosophical and more or less Socialist addresses to a limited public. We must go into all the world and preach a real saving gospel to every creature.

Under the name of Social Theism I present my contribution towards the solution of these problems.

Chicago, Illinois. WILLIAM H. SEED.

Unburied Dead

Editor of UNITY:

A gruesome story, of universal interest because relating to the World War, was published last December in *La Muevi*, the official Ido (international language) organ of Belgian youth. A translation follows:

400,000 Killed in France Not Yet Buried

"The bodies of 400,000 soldiers, mostly Germans, who had perished in the Lorette valley are still unburied. Today, fourteen years after that damnable slaughter, the bodies are still found in the same positions in which they had been struck down by the hell-fire of shrapnel and gas bombs, and the atmosphere is infected with loathsome fetidity.

"The sights are horrifying and the stench al-

most unbearable so that the greatest courage, even heroism, is required to remove and bury this putrid mass of human beings, many of whom still hold hand-grenades in their vise-like grasp. As one was taken from the rigid fingers, it exploded, tearing the corpse into fragments and killing the workman. After this occurrence many refused to work in this inferno any longer. It will be a long time before the last of the 400,000 will have found their final quiet and worthy resting place. If only it would be possible to bury militarism definitely and forever together with these innocent victims!"

And during all these years those responsible for all these horrors in and after war bow in hypocritical reverence while placing a wreath upon the tomb of the "Unknown Soldier"! A just Nemesis would compel those human monsters, who conduct the affairs of nations and continue to prepare for another world-wide slaughter-fest, to step down into this valley of nauseous putrefaction and to bury their innocent victims, instead of forcing the poor to earn their bread at this revolting labor.

Now, how would it do if, instead of showing our gold-star mothers the peaceful and well-kept cemeteries where their boys lie, our government should take them to view this realistic scene so similar to the ones in which their sons met their doom? If the stench does not reach Heaven, it might touch their hearts through their olfactory nerves.

And all the frightful, stultifying wickedness of warfare could be stopped now, *now, today!* Why are illiberal rulers allowed to keep the world under the dominance of atavistic ideas and customs? Why are not the reason and intelligence now available called upon to rule? Why will voters of the large and powerful working classes send men with antiquated ideas to make laws that only prolong the world's evils? Why do they not put in office men of integrity and principle who will stand like adamant for decency—for justice for all working people, and for the instantaneous strangulation of the monstrous octopus of war whose tentacles even now are gripping every nation and threatening the world's complete annihilation! Why? Why?

K.

International Language (Ido) Ass'n of America, Ridgefield, New Jersey.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 18)

before prohibition to tell quite accurately how many speakeasies there were in a given city or area. For instance, when Chicago had 7,800 licensed saloons twenty-five years ago, the records show that 19,000 Government special stamp tax receipts were taken out, showing that there were 11,200 speakeasies in the city at that time.

This is quite in contrast with the recent wild guesses made by the wet propagandists who have been claiming that there were 32,000 speakeasies in New York City, and 28,000 speakeasies in Detroit, and similar conditions in other cities. As a matter of fact, there are now absolutely no records from which such figures can be compiled. The wets went so far as to make up what purported to be maps showing where these speakeasies were located in New York City, and elsewhere. When the Federal agents took this data and made a careful and complete investigation they found that instead of 32,000 speakeasies in New York City there were only 1,898 places where it might be possible that liquor was being sold, and 900 of these were in process of being closed up.

It may interest you to know that the terms "bootlegger," "blind tiger," "blind pig," "speakeasy" are all of them at least seventy-five years old. It might be refreshing for you to read the irresistible speeches of John B. Gough, Frances E. Willard and John G. Wooley of that earlier time where you will find these terms used again and again.

In this connection it should be borne in mind that in the days of the saloon there were often two or more speakeasies owned by each saloon, which paid the Federal license fee, but never paid anything to the state on account of their corrupt alliance with politics. Indeed, that was one of the principal ways by which the liquor traffic began to corrupt the political life of the country.

But in addition to these speakeasies run by and owned by the saloonkeepers, there were innumerable bootleggers who ran independent establishments. It is of special interest to know that we got our present definition of "non-intoxicating liquor," namely, one-half of one per cent, because of these bootleggers.

It is a matter of history that forty-five years ago Sheridan Shook, the St. Louis brewer, called a convention of brewers, distillers and wine merchants and retail liquor dealers, to deal with the complaint that there were from two to four bootleggers to every saloon-keeper, and "that they sell around our doors, in our back yards and alleys, in front of our places from wagons; when we arrest them they say that 'we are selling a milder stuff and not intoxicating.' They get off with it. We want as a definition of what is intoxicating liquor anything above one-half of one per cent."

They sent a deputation to Washington and had this definition enacted into law, and then forty-two states out of forty-eight made it their standard.

To show that this speakeasy evil has existed for nearly 100 years, I give you certain facts culled from newspapers over that entire period:

In Kentucky in 1838 there were 1,200 saloons and 2,400 speakeasies.

In 1864 there were 315 licensed saloons and 6,925 speakeasies in New York City and Brooklyn.

In 1865 in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., 80 saloons and 120 speakeasies.

In 1890 in Philadelphia there were 1,204 saloons and 4,500 speakeasies, and in 1896, 1,677 saloons and 7,000 speakeasies.

In 1890 in Pittsburgh there were 93 saloons and 800 speakeasies.

In 1896, in Alleghany County, Pa., as a whole there were 1,048 saloons and 2,300 speakeasies.

In 1900, in Alleghany County, there were 2,300 unlicensed liquor places and 1,047 licensed saloons.

In 1903 an editorial in the Pittsburgh *Post,* of June 3rd, speaks of the speakeasy evil as the Root of Civic Wrongdoing. It says, "It is widespread and always on the increase" . . . "The speakeasies become the haunts and abodes of crime . . . by the connivance and practically the aid of the officers of the law."

In 1906, in Kansas City, Mo., there were 600 saloons and 2,000 speakeasies.

In 1908, in Minneapolis, there were 4,000 speakeasies.

My own conviction is that we have less than one-fourth of the number of speakeasies under prohibition than we had in the old saloon days, and then we had the saloon in addition.

Specifically, I would say that I *do* think the speakeasy is a decided improvement over the old saloon, for the following reasons:

1. That to have the old saloon we had to have the legalized manufacture and sale of beverage alcohol, and this means the domination of the political and social life by the liquor power. That régime was, as President Hoover so truly said, "Smashed as by a stroke of lightning" by national prohibition. It is these "smashed" national and international liquor interests which are making this desperate fight to have the outlaw restored to respectability.

2. The old saloon on every street corner advertised its products openly, and no young man could walk down the streets of our cities and towns without being invited to "come in and take a drink." The treating system was all but universal. Every one who walks up and down our streets today knows that this condition of open solicitation does not prevail in America today.

3. The speakeasy is not now permitted to advertise a dangerous, habit-forming narcotic drug, such as was permitted when we had the old saloon. The speakeasy was and is illegal, and carries on its business behind closed doors, and in out of the way places. The saloon, if again legalized, could carry on its business on every street corner and along the public highway, and the brewers would use the billboards, the radio, and the movie to solicit the youth of every American home to form the habit of drinking alcoholic liquors.

Yes, Mrs. Sabin, I prefer the speakeasy to the old saloon, but both must go where slavery and duelling have gone.

Question 3. Do you believe that when St. Paul said, "Be ye temperate in all things," that he asked us to abstain from all things?

Answer. No. He was not talking about total abstinence at that time. But at another time he was, and then he said, "If meat makes my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world stands."

If you will take your Bible and look up the context you will see that St. Paul was endeavoring to protect the weak brother "for whom Christ died." I think that this text is worthy of careful consideration by the cocktail-serving mothers of today who may be strong in themselves to "take it or leave it alone," but who set a very poor example for the weak brother and little children.

Question 4. What is your opinion of the legislator who votes dry and drinks wet?

Answer. I think he is the same sort of a man as the man who is dry in personal habits, but who talks wet to get political office or to win votes for his party, or to make money out of the liquor traffic. I think that any man, wet or dry, who seeks to evade or nullify the law is a foe to American ideals and a traitor to American political institutions.

Question 5. Where in the teachings of Christ do you find that which would lead you to believe that he was a prohibitionist?

Answer. You might as well ask me to find anywhere anything which would lead me to think that he was a technocrat or a Democrat. Fortunately for us, the teachings of Jesus Christ were not founded on the shifting sands of political terminology or political expediency.

While not being able to point to any passage of Scripture that would answer the question as to whether Christ was or was not a prohibitionist in our Twentieth Century meaning of the term, I do find his teachings full of words such as these: "Jesus called a little child unto him and set him in the midst of them and said . . . Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depths of the sea."

We know that when Jesus Christ was dying upon the Cross and was suffering the terrible thirst of one in physical extremity "they offered him wine flavored with myrrh, but *he would not drink it.*" (See Mark 15:23, Moffatt's translation.)

It is quite certain that if there had been a prohibition law in his time he would have *obeyed* it, for he said, "I come not to destroy the law, but to fulfil"; and again, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

Question 6. Do you think that it is the proper function of the Church to enter into the field of politics?

Answer. Yes, I most certainly think so. I believe in the separation of the Church and state. I believe that the Church ought never to enter the political arena for her own ecclesiastical or temporal aggrandizement. The right of a church to enter politics for its own temporal ends cannot be defended; but the Church should use her power to rebuke, to guide, to counsel, to support and to defeat. She should exercise her political influence justly, righteously, and with a love for all, free from partisanship and religious intolerance. The right of a church in politics "on moral issues cannot be abandoned, in a democracy, without abridging the workings of democracy itself."

The teachings of Christ show clearly that he considered every part of human life within the concern of God and of his church. Through all the ages the Church has been in conflict with political oppression, and with all manner of racial injustice and social evil.

The history of the Church is a succession of bloody battlefields where final victory was achieved over crucifixion as a method of punishment, over gladiatorial combats, polygamy and concubinage, piracy and human slavery. Great battles are now being fought over child welfare, industrial oppression, the narcotic trade, the social evils, and the liquor traffic. The welfare of womanhood has been of primary concern to the Church, and if the Church had not entered politics, you, Mrs. Sabin, would not have the right to vote.

Perhaps I can summarize my thought by the following illustration:

When Governor Hughes in New York State was fighting race-track gambling, the professional gamblers asked Speaker Wadsworth for a private hearing before the Rules Committee. He consented, provided the introducer of the anti-gambling bill and some clergyman whom he would choose were present. The Assemblyman chose an Episcopalian rector. When the clergyman arose to speak at the hearing, a member of the Rules Committee said, "Do you not think you ought to go back to your church where you belong and attend to your own business?" The reply of the clergyman ought to become historic. He said, "I not only have a right to be here, but at this particular moment I have a right to be nowhere else!"

When the "Beer by Christmas" proponents were trying to rush the Collier Beer Bill through the House by refusing to let it go to the Judiciary Committee where it properly belonged, and instead put it in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee to make it appear that it was a revenue measure only, that committee refused to invite to the hearings the milk producers, ice cream manufacturers, candy makers, the automobile industry and other great business enterprises that would be adversely affected by the legalization of wine and beer.

They did, however, invite the brewers, the very people who were outlawed by the Eighteenth Amendment and who were responsible for the conditions in the old saloon days. The committee not only listened to the advice of representatives of the brewers and sought their help in shaping the bill, but they increased the alcoholic content as originally written in the bill because of the argument presented by the brewers that by so doing more beer could be sold and therefore more money be obtained from taxes.

We have here the unique spectacle of the outlawed traffic invited to Washington to sit around the council table with the representatives of the United States Government to devise ways and means by which that part of the Constitution which put them out of business could be nullified.

At a time like that the representatives of the Christian Church not only had a right to be there, but they had a right to be nowhere else at that time!

I claim no infallibility of judgment in matters of this kind, but since you asked for my opinion I sum it up in these words:

The Church has the same right to influence public sentiment that its enemies have, and in this particular matter of prohibition quite as much right as the brewers and distillers have. In that sense I do believe that it is the proper function of the Church to enter the field of politics.

—*Woman's Temperance Work.*

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....

IMPORTANT!!!!

The March-April issue of

The New Humanist

includes the following significant articles, reviews and poetry

WHAT IS HUMANISM?
John H. Dietrich

PHILOSOPHY AND SHIRT-SLEEVES
Max C. Otto

RELIGION IN VARIOUS CULTURES
A. Eustace Haydon

THE UNIQUENESS OF MAN
Raymond B. Bragg

HUMANISM STATES ITS CASE
Edwin H. Wilson

A MAVERICK PSYCHOLOGIST
Maynard Shipley

THE CASE OF MR. BABBITT
Carl H. Grabo

THE EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY
Oliver L. Reiser

THRUSH CLEAR
Julia N. Budlong

To neglect the New Humanist is to fail to keep abreast of the most important trends of modern thought.

Single Copy 20c Yearly $1.00
Foreign $1.25

105 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois